DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 150 062 95 SO 010 662

AUTHOR	Wallace, Joan D., Ed.
TITLE	Implications of American Democratic Civic Ethics for Schools.
INSTITUTION	Research for Better Schools, Inc., Philadelphia, Pa.
SPONS AGENCY	Hazen Foundation, New Haven, Conn.; Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	77
NOTE	46p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Publications Office, Research for Better Schools, Inc., Suite 1700, 1700 Market Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103 ($1.00, paper cover)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*Citizenship; Citizenship Responsibility; Community Attitudes; Curriculum Development; Democratic Values; *Educational Environment; Educational Finance; *Educational Problems; Elementary Secondary Education; Equal Education; Equal Opportunities (Jobs); Equal Protection; Ethical Values; Ethics; Human Dignity; Justice; *Moral Development; Moral Values; *School Role; Social Attitudes; Teacher Role

ABSTRACT

The pamphlet contains proceedings of a panel discussion about key issues surrounding the Ethical-Citizenship Education (ECE) movement. The five panelists represented institutions of higher education, the U.S. Office of Education, and a national research organization. Three questions served as the basis for discussion: (1) what are the core civic ethics of American democracy? (2) what is the school's responsibility for teaching these core civic ethics? (3) what immediate action might the school take regarding instruction in these core civic ethics? The following elements were seen to comprise core civic ethics: respect for individual dignity and group consensus, equal opportunity and justice under the law, and belief in public responsibility. The school's responsibility was seen to be one of indoctrinating children with core ethics, especially at this time of weakening influence from church and family. Teachers should be examples of values in action, and the classroom and playground should serve as arenas for values dialogue. Possible immediate courses of action include developing national and local leadership for ECE, identifying common competencies and civic ethics that are essential for contemporary adult life, and solving the problems of fiscal inequities among states so that opportunities for ECE program development can be equal. (AV)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED150062

IMPLICATIONS OF AMERICAN DEMOCRATIC CIVIC ETHICS FOR SCHOOLS

A symposium discussion
on June 16, 1977
in Washington, DC
by
Russell L Adams
John Ellis
Max Lerner
Louis J Rubin
Ralph W Tyler

Edited by
Joan D Wallace

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Research for
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

Sponsored by
The Edward W Hazen Foundation
The United States Office of Education

The symposium was organized and carried out by Research for Better Schools, Inc.

Russell A Hill, Director, Ethical-Citizenship Education, was in charge of the program.

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

SP 010 662

Published by
Research for Better Schools, Inc.
1700 Market Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103

Ethical-Citizenship Education
Director:
Russell A Hill
Editor:
Joan D Wallace

Copyright © Research for Better Schools, Inc. 1977

The opinions expressed in this publication
do not necessarily reflect the position
or policy of the funding agencies,
and no official endorsement by them
should be inferred.

Design: Peter Maxwell

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

Ethical-Citizenship Education (ECE), a program of Research for Better Schools, has as its objective the development of ECE programs and their introduction in schools (public, nonpublic, and parochial) across the nation wishing to undertake such activity. Common to all ECE programs is the following instructional goal: to teach students the knowledge, skills, and dispositions which will enable them to realize in action the civic ethics basic to American democratic traditions. Chief among these civic ethics are: caring for the interest of self and others; equal consideration for all persons; rational decision-making; and, by extension, liberty, justice, and equality. The program is based on school-community cooperation, a strategy which explicitly calls for flexibility and adaptation of ECE approaches according to local community needs and perceptions. The ECE effort will promote and support state and local educational agencies in building the capacity to attain the program objective. Public policy, theory-building, research, development, and dissemination are seen as supporting task-force areas.

Advisory Group

Russell L. Adams
Howard University

Monsignor Francis X. Barrett
Executive Secretary
National Catholic Education Association

Vivian R. Bowser
Executive Committee
National Education Association

William L. Bradley
President
The Edward W. Hazen Foundation

Harry S. Broudy
University of Illinois

Gordon Cawelti
Executive Director
Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development

William R. Clauss
Associate in Humanities Education
New York State Education Department

Homer O. Elseroad
Director of Elementary/Secondary Department
Education Commission of the States

J. Blaine Fister
Director
Public Education Concerns
National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A.

George S. Johnson
Acting Director
Institute for Jewish Policy Planning & Research
Synagogue Council of America

Margaret J. Jones
Associate Director
National Foundation for the Improvement of Education

Carol Kimmel
Past President
National Congress of Parents and Teachers

Position and Research Papers published by Research for Better Schools, Inc on Ethical-Citizenship Education

Bell T.H. *Morality and citizenship education: Whose responsibility? Occasional Paper No. 1,* 1976.

Blum, M. *Ethical-Citizenship Education policies and programs: A national survey of State Education Agencies. Technical Report,* 1977.

Broudy, H.S. *Moral/ citizenship education: Potentials and limitations. Occasional Paper No. 3,* 1977.

Fenton, E. *The relationship of citizenship education to values education. Occasional Paper No. 2,* 1977.

Hill, R.A. *Ethical/Moral Action Instructional Program. Position Paper No. 1,* 1975.

Hill, R.A., Wallace J., Newcombe, E., & Young, J. *Research studies reporting experimental effects in the moral/ethical/values domain: An annotated bibliography,* 1977.

Hill, R.A., & Wallace, J. *Report on the National Conference on Planning for Moral/Citizenship Education,* 1976.

Hill, R.A., & Wallace, J. *Recommendations for a R, D, and D agenda in ethical-citizenship education,* 1976.

Klafter, M., & Wallace J. *A bibliography on moral/values education,* 1976.

Sanders, N.M. *Plans for the field test of the Ethical/Moral Action Instructional Program. Position Paper No. 2,* 1975.

Sanders, N.M., & Klafter, M. *The importance and desired characteristics of moral/ ethical education in the public schools: A systematic analysis of recent documents,* 1975.

Sanders, N.M., & Wallace, J. *Teacher and parent opinion concerning moral/ethical education in the public schools: A report of an Institute for Survey Research study,* 1975.

Lawrence Kohlberg
Harvard University

Elaine Marks
Executive Committee
National Education Association

Karl Massanari
Associate Director
American Association of
Colleges for Teacher
Education

Milton Rokeach
Washington State University

Louis J. Rubin
University of Illinois

William J. Russell
Executive Officer
American Educational Research
Association

John A. Stagg
Education Director
Graphic Arts International Union

Ralph W. Tyler
Senior Consultant
Office of the President
Science Research Associates, Inc.

Harold H. Viehman
Director
Ministry in Public Education
A coalition representing:
The American Baptist
Churches in the U.S.A.
The Presbyterian Church in
the U.S.A.
The United Church of Christ
The United Methodist Church
The United Presbyterian
Church in the U.S.A.

Carolyn Warner
Chief State School Officer,
Arizona
Council of Chief State School
Officers

Russell A. Hill
Program Director

Table of Contents

Overview viii

Editorial Note xii

The Proceedings 1

What Are the Core Civic Ethics of American Democracy? 2

What Is the School's Responsibility for Teaching These Core Civic Ethics? 12

What Immediate Action Might the School Take Regarding Instruction in These Core Civic Ethics? . 22

Closing Comments 31

Appendix 1: Panelists and Participants 33

Appendix 2: Biographical Sketches of Panelists 34

Overview

The current call for effective ethical-citizen education is far from a new rallying cry or "instant slogan." In fact, it is a reiteration of, and a recommitment to, one of the foundations of our democracy: the preparation of a citizenry concerned with our core civic ethics and equipped to take part in civic affairs. This renewed emphasis is reflected in all sectors of our society, from grass-roots communities to the federal Administration and Congressional levels, from leading professionals of many disciplines to a variety of concerned laypersons and lay interests.

Symposium, Ethical-Citizenship Education

This document reports on a symposium convened to address key issues surrounding the Ethical-Citizenship Education (ECE) movement — concerns, caveats, recommendation, and potentialities. It took place June 16, 1977, in Washington, D.C. The symposium panelists spoke to an audience limited to Administration, Congressional staff, and educational leaders (see Appendix 1) who commented at intervals. Three major questions served as a springboard for the discussion:

1. What Are the Core Civic Ethics of American Democracy?
2. What Is the School's Responsibility for Teaching These Core Civic Ethics?
3. What Immediate Action Might the School Take Regarding Instruction in These CoreCivic Ethics?

The symposium was sponsored by two groups: The Edward W. Hazen Foundation and the U.S. Office of Education.

The Hazen Foundation has for many years supported educational ventures in various aspects of higher education. In recent years it has selected four priority areas: "(1) improvement of educational institutions in order to promote personal growth as well as learning; (2) creation of opportunities for young people to develop and apply insights, skills, and experience toward the solution of contemporary individual and social problems; (3) the encouragement of interest in esthetic, moral, and religious values, particularly as they relate to the achievement of cultural parity among people at local, national, and international levels" (*The Edward W. Hazen Foundation: A Fifty Year Survey and Triennial Report, 1973-1975*). We are grateful for The Hazen Foundation's help in carrying out the symposium as part of a larger overall ECE program (see below).

The U.S. Office of Education, within the past few years, has established a Task Force on Citizen Education. This unit has worked closely with the overall ECE program and contributed both ideas and funds to the symposium.

Research for Better Schools, a Philadelphia-based educational research and development laboratory, contracted to direct the program. The laboratory served as the host group and carried out the symposium plans from conceptualization to execution. The laboratory has designated citizen education as one of its major program components for the next five years.

An Advisory Group, established early during the genesis of the overall ECE program, contributed wit and wisdom to all phases of the symposium event.

We believe this report of the symposium is intellectually exciting, of interest to a variety of concerns and disciplines, and a source of recommendations and suggested directions of immediate and long-range value to the ECE field. It is our hope that it provided a forum which will stimulate the Administration and Congress to intensify their support of ECE as a priority at all educational levels.

The Overall ECE Program

As stated, the symposium was part of a larger ECE program whose objective is the development of ECE programs and their introduction in schools (public, nonpublic, and parochial) across the nation wishing to undertake such activity.

The following factors give impetus to and underlie past and present ECE efforts:

—There is a growing insistence across the country for the introduction of ECE-like programs in schools. The insistence comes from parents, political leaders, state and local education agencies, educational leaders, religious leaders, and the general public — as evidenced by surveys, public statements, polls, policy statements, and the media.

—There is a growing body of new and promising research and theory directly related to ECE. This knowledge makes possible the development of powerful and valid educational programs that enable students to realize ECE objectives.

—There is a plan for a coordinated program of R, D, and D in the ECE domain which has the endorsement of a wide constituency, including prominent leaders in education, religion, the research community, parent groups, and school practitioners. The plan is based on school-community cooperation and specifically calls for local adaptation of ECE programs according to differing community needs and perceptions.

The ECE program had its genesis in a year-long planning program funded in 1976 by the National Institute of Education. The objective of the planning effort, carried out by Research for Better Schools, was the preparation of planning recommendations for an ECE R, D, and D plan. Major planning accomplishments included:

— Development of documented need and mandate statements;
— Development of an ECE definition which commands broad consensus;
— Development of an advocacy/constituency across educational, religious, and civic publics;
— Collection of judgments/recommendations from ECE experts;
— Collection and analysis of ECE literature;
— Development of cross-communication in the broadly defined ECE field;
— Conceptualization of the ECE research and theory into four major domains of activity: the developmentalists, as represented by Havighurst, Kohlberg, and Piaget; the decision theorists, as represented by Peters, Rawls, and Wilson; the values theorists, as represented by Lasswell, Raths, and Rokeach; and the prosocial researchers, as represented by Bandura, Hoffman, and Staub;
— Formation of an eminent Advisory Group;
— Convocation of a National ECE Conference;
— Publication of a number of reports, papers, and resource documents related to various aspects of ECE;
— Preparation of a coordinated plan for ECE R, D, and D (referred to above) based on the recommendations developed during the planning phase.

The current program emphasis is to present the case for ECE to various audiences. To this end, under the continued leadership of the Advisory Group, a series of symposia (the first of which this publication reports) is being held. The objectives are:

— To obtain the assistance and support of the educational community and selected publics for coordination of multilevel ECE efforts;
— To obtain the assistance and support of educational leaders in the Administration and federal government for ECE program development at all levels;
— To explore the possibilities and strategies for developing federal legislation and state leadership to support a variety of ECE efforts;
— To publish and disseminate symposia dialogues and other informational material to foster communication and cooperation among the many persons, groups, and activities in the ECE field.

Support, leadership, and coordination are needed to make ECE a reality.

For further information and documentation, contact:
Russell A Hill
Director, Ethical-Citizenship Education
Research for Better Schools, Inc
1700 Market Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103
215-561-4100

Panelists

Russell L. Adams	Chairman Department of Afro-American Studies Howard University
John Ellis	Executive Deputy Commissioner for Educational Programs U.S. Office of Education
Max Lerner	Syndicated Columnist *New York Post*
Louis J. Rubin *Moderator*	Professor-at-Large University of Illinois
Ralph W. Tyler	Senior Consultant Science Research Associates, Inc.

Editorial Note

The editor requests the reader's indulgence in condoning some editorial imperfections — from the purist's point of view — in this document. In the difficult task of converting the spoken symposium dialogue to written language, we have made a deliberate effort to preserve both the individual style of the panelists and the spontaneity which characterized the event. Thus, we have deliberately turned our back on some editorial sacred cows, allowing nonsentences, occasional repetition for emphasis, and some syntactic anomalies to stand — again, to capture the flavor of responsive, extemporaneous speech. It is our hope that the reading is the better (and more fun) for this editorial elasticity.

THE PROCEEDINGS

Louis J Rubin

Let me briefly summarize the genesis of this meeting. Some 18 months ago *Research for Better Schools* recognized that a crisis was rapidly developing in the general area of "moral/values/ethical" education. (I might say parenthetically that those terms are often used interchangeably, and attempts at precise definitions and distinctions among them are seldom pleasing to all.) Russ Hill, of *Research for Better Schools*, directed a planning year in the domain, which culminated in a national convocation of distinguished scholars in Philadelphia in the summer of 1976. The proceedings of that conference, and other activities provided the basis for a R, D, and D plan for *Ethical-Citizenship Education (ECE)*. That plan is in published form and is available for your review. It has attracted a broad constituency and advocacy.

We are now in a sort of second-generation endeavor designed to present the case for *ECE* to various audiences and to seek the support of leaders in the educational establishment, Congress, and the Administration for enabling legislation for *ECE*.

The distinguished panel assembled here today has been asked to address three important questions concerning *ECE*:

1 **What Are the Core Civic Ethics of American Democracy?**

2 **What Is the School's Responsibility for Teaching These Core Civic Ethics?**

3 **What Immediate Action Might the School Take Regarding Instruction in These Core Civic Ethics?**

Let me suggest that we deal with the questions in roughly equal amounts of time. I will ask the panelists to make a five-minute introduction presentation on each question as it arises. The discussion will then broaden to include the audience as well as fellow panelists.

WHAT ARE THE CORE CIVIC ETHICS OF AMERICAN DEMOCRACY?

Max Lerner

I have jotted down a brief series of civilization values which I would suggest as being possible core civic ethics. If there is time later, I'd like to outline a support system for them.

First, access. Equal access to equal life chances, not just for some but for all in the society. Harold Lasky said, "When the leaders of a people ask their followers to die for a dream, they have a right to know in whose behalf the dream is being dreamt." I think there is a dream at the core of every society, and I think the American dream is that of equal access to equal life chances. This does not imply any guarantee of equality of result; it means only some kind of collective effort in the society to provide, as far as possible, for equality of opportunity.

Second, as a complement to access — and of course we tend to emphasize the access, not the complement — civility, that is, a sense of respect for the viewpoints, the urgencies, the purposes, and the values of others. Therefore, a sense of limits on the society and on the individual's behavior in the society. I can perhaps best illustrate this pair of ethics by recalling the 1960s — the most scouring, traumatic, but at the same time, most immaterial revolutionary decade in our history. The stress, of course, was on expanding access, equal access, not on the sense of limits and civility. We had to develop a sense of limits in order to contain the revolutionary explosion of that decade. Only now, in the 1970s, are we beginning to understand that crucial sense of limits or, as I call it civility.

Third, equal justice under the law. This involves not only an equitable framework of law and the administration of justice, but also the establishment of a ceiling which no man's power can exceed and a floor below which no person, no matter how weak, illiterate, and so on, can fall.

Fourth, competition of ideas, not only for the sake of minorities, but in order to get majority action. You cannot make majority choices unless you can choose between competing ideas, visions or, put another way, between alternative futures for the society. By this I mean competition of ideas for both minorities and majority choices and, by the same token, competition of abilities in terms of incentive

systems and reward systems in any society.

Fifth, a sense of human connectedness. I call this by the Latin term *nexus* — a sense of linkage between human beings in the society, because what happens to others does in a real sense happen to the rest of us.

Ralph W Tyler

In considering what our core civic ethics are, I would like to recall the development of the *National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP)*. The *NAEP* objectives — what the schools should be expected to attain — were formulated originally by schoolpeople and scholars, and then critically reviewed by public panels. To achieve consensus on the objectives, we had panels in four parts of the United States, made up of people from many walks of life. The panelists were nominated especially for this task by various groups ranging from the *NAACP*, to labor groups, to manufacturers' groups, and so on.

With respect to citizenship, let me list some of the *NAEP* objectives that the panels of concerned citizens considered highly appropriate for the schools:

First and Second (generally viewed as basic to all human relations), honesty and truthfulness.

Third, respect for the dignity and worth of every individual regardless of his background, race, religion, ethnic group, income, and the like.

Fourth, a sense of caring about other people.

Fifth, and closely related, the Golden Rule, do unto others as you would have them do to you.

Sixth, fairness, equal opportunity for and equal treatment of persons in similar circumstances.

Seventh, a concern for settling conflicts among persons in a peaceful, orderly, and just fashion.

Eighth, respect for constituted authority, concern for recognizing authority in order to organize activities.

Ninth, dependable exercise of responsibility.

Tenth, the view that rewards to people should be earned, not casually given away.

It seems to me that those ten points would probably be among those considered appropriate for the schools because of their common acceptance by the many population sectors represented in the *NAEP* review panels.

Russell L Adams

I'll try to summarize my views. It seems to me that a core civic ethic of American democracy can be stated as a ques-

tion: At what minimal cost to others can one gain maximum benefit for one's own life, both from an individual perspective and in concert with others? The evolution of the concept of human freedom is reflected in the question.

To define my terms, maximum benefit — getting all one can at a minimum cost to others — means that the natural potential of the individual is given as full a range of options as society is capable of supporting.

Our ethics derive from attempts to define what man is in essence, what man is in action, what man can become alone, and what man can become in concert with his fellows. Let me present some dualistic terms which I have listed as humanistic polarities:

First, the nonexploitative celebration of self, very much a part of the American dream, versus the self-effacing conformity to the dominant values of the group. We can think of the great individualists of American history who, in contemporary terms, "did their own thing." Daniel Boone "let it all hang out." At the same time, a kind of Calvinistic coercion still flashes forth whether in Miami or Massachusetts.

Second, the rule of law as a norm for "public" matters versus the use of law as a means in "private" matters.

Third, the permissiveness of majority opinion versus the imperatives of minority rights.

Fourth, the idea of the philosophic equality (ethical, moral, and legal) of citizens versus the concept of the pragmatic inequalities of individuals as performers and producers. This brings into play the concept of merit versus the concept of equality.

Fifth, the belief in the efficacy of negotiations versus the belief in the efficacy of coercion, physical or psychological.

Sixth, the belief in public responsibility versus the belief in private liability.

These kinds of polar terms, in a sense, capture for me some of the real ambivalence associated with getting at our core civic ethics or norms, ethical absolutes. There is a paradoxical quality about them. You press one side of a polarity and end up on the other side of it. I suspect that most of our lives are spent somewhere between the various poles I've listed.

John Ellis

I was asked to represent the position of the school practitioner. My credentials as such are bogus at present because I have been a bureaucrat for the last three months. Let me state that today I speak for myself only, not for the bureaucracy.

I would suggest that five major threads twist around each other to help form the core of American civic ethics:

First, liberty. From the inception of the nation, a desire to be free from tyranny or any form of repressive government has been a guiding principle. It is expressed in the Declaration of Independence and has repeatedly surfaced throughout our history. It has not always been realized in practice, as minorities can fervently attest, but it has been a pervasive principle. This nation, comprised of diverse peoples from around the world, to a remarkable degree responds to the drumbeat of liberty.

Second, equality. We reject the notion of royalty, although we are fascinated by the pageantry associated with it. Part of the equality principle (some might consider this a separate civic ethic) is the dignity of each individual. Each human is considered to have inherent nobility and worth in our democracy.

Third, self-government, or perhaps more accurately, representative government.

Fourth, respect for law, a corollary of self-government. While views differ on specific laws and their interpretation, and while we are becoming an increasingly litigious society, respect for the law and for the processes associated with forming, following, and changing it are central to our form of government.

Fifth, concern for community. Perhaps this principle was forced upon us as early immigrants faced a harsh environment. Perhaps it is based in part on the religious beliefs of many of our people. In any event, Americans display to an astonishing degree a concern for community. Civic organizations and volunteers dot the landscape. While many groups and individuals are self-serving and indifferent to the commonweal, many more are motivated by eleemosynary concerns, and we are better for it.

This ethical core that I have suggested will take new forms with each generation, although the basics will remain relatively constant. Today we are engaged in making those principles a reality for those historically bypassed because of race, sex, or handicap. It is a process that requires constant attention.

Louis J Rubin

May I now invite both panelists and audience to dispute something that has been said, emphasize agreement, add to the mix, question further, or whatever they wish.

Msgr. Francis X Barrett

I am not prepared to give out my points on core civic ethics. As to both the feelings of "the church" and my own personal feelings, I sense in all the statements so far a lack of what has been fundamental to the American Constitution, our democracy, and everything else, namely, the presence of God and the effect of religion upon ethics. We won't have an effective core of civic ethics if it isn't founded on religious belief.

Russell L Adams

May I reply? I was requested simply to give my list of core civic ethics. I would now like to amplify that list by citing some of my sources or supports:

First, religion, the Judaeo-Christian legacy.

Second, a naturalistic legacy; in Jeffersonian terms, "the law of nature and nature's gods."

Third, the great American public documents, some reflecting the religious legacy of Europe, others reflecting political learning of the past, and still others reflecting the social insights of the American experience, for instance, the inadmissibility of human slavery.

Fourth, the ongoing experience of American life and action as reflected in social debates and interest-group struggles — which would include religious groups.

Louis J Rubin

Carol Kimmel is Past President of the *National Congress of Parents and Teachers*. Carol, do you think the *PTA* membership, if asked, would endorse any one of these listings of core civic ethics, or the whole lot, for general educational application in the schools?

Carol Kimmel

Yes, I think so. As an organization we have always supported the teaching of moral values, and we have struggled to include in education preparation for parenthood and other dimensions that we think are part of social values.

Jerry L. Fletcher

It seems to me that we need to discuss the way in which allegiance to general values affects a person's action in a particular situation. It has often been pointed out that there are both general societal values and individual values. What happens over and over again in American society is that two general values come into conflict when we try to decide what to do in a specific instance. In some cases that conflict gets settled in a court case, and the case law becomes the definition of what we mean by several general values.

For most of us, however, the conflict doesn't get resolved in court. More likely it is through our interaction with other people in various circumstances that we work out the meaning and arrive at our own balance regarding values. I'd like to have the panel talk about how an individual learns where he stands on some of the dichotomies posited by Dr. Adams.

Max Lerner

Yes, I think that's very much worth talking about. I think Dr. Adams has been extremely evocative and provocative, particularly in terms of his polarities. In general, I don't like dualisms. I am basically monistic in my approach. But I think before you can be monistic you've got to see what the polarities are.

My approach is dialectical. I start with the polarities, with the thesis and antithesis, but I move on to the synthesis. As a group and a society, I think we also need to do this — constantly move from the polarities, move from the thesis and antithesis to the synthesis. I think it is necessary for us as a people to grapple with the polarities that face all of us.

I think the best illustration of this is, again, the 1960s — the development of a challenger system of values set alongside the traditional values system. If you take the two values systems, first the traditional one, derived from Judaeo-Christian ethics and from the whole of Western intellectual history and political institutions, and second the challenger system, derived from our recent experience, particularly from the discontents of minority groups, youth groups, women's groups, and so on — if you put these two systems side by side, can we get a synthesis out of them?

At the present time, as you know, there are movements around the country — called variously human-awareness movements, human-potential movements — which reflect discontent with the kind of prison in which we have been caught, the armature that confines us as individuals and as

a society. The effort is to break through that armature, to get out of that prison in some ways, to achieve some kind of fulfillment.

Again, the question is: How do you pit this against traditional cultural experience and get some kind of synthesis? I would like to suggest two things:

First, the traditional values partly come out of the experience of America, the experience of the West, and so on, but they also come out of the human endowment. If we talk about the human endowment, again there are polarities, for it is a double endowment. Are we fallen angels or risen apes? To a considerable extent we are both because both are to be found in our whole genetic endowment. Man is creative, man is destructive and again the problem of a synthesis emerges.

Second, we have need systems, not just as Americans but as human beings. Humans need growth, they need security, they need a sense of selfhood or identity. They need a sense of belonging, they need a sense of meaning, they need a sense of feeling and interacting with others. They need a belief system, a way of believing.

These are needs of Americans and of all human beings. If we think in terms of our basic genetic endowment and our basic need systems, then we can get at some roots of the American educational system (indeed of the American family system as well) within which values are formed and needs emerge and are expressed. The values we list are the outcroppings of something much, much deeper; they are rooted in the history of man himself and his needs as well as in our history as a people.

Russell L Adams

I want to comment on Dr. Lerner's notion of synthesis. One of the things we haven't talked about is value convergence. Ethical principles of a variety of social systems which appear to compete or conflict at one level may in fact converge at a higher level. The ubiquity of the Golden Rule, or variations on it, in almost all religions illustrates this point. We have not, however, capitalized on the ability of the young, junior high, and maybe grammar school kids to be natural philosophers and natural traditionalists, uncontaminated by manipulative bias. They are Puritans of the concept of justice, Puritans of the concept of worth, and so forth, when they first hear of them, for they are without ulterior motives. It is a beautiful opportunity for us to begin to deal with the content of these concepts when there is maximum youthful attachment to them.

It should also be mentioned that there is a whole set of values connected with how our core civic ethics are

realized, what we might call procedural values. Let's take as an example the concept of access in terms of, say, employment opportunities for minorities. Today we are in a dilemma over implementing affirmative action, a procedural issue of the access concept. How do you admit and redress imbalance, with the kind of justice that costs the least and does the most?

John Ellis

I would like to return to and build on a topic mentioned earlier: the role of the family, particularly with regard to the powerful principle of positive example. I met a woman, I'll call her Jane Smith, who, at some hardship, filled a volunteer community job in the evenings, after she left her menial daytime job. She had taken in three children to rear, and the family was facing a Christmas with very little money. Each of the children asked for, and received, one present — which was all she could afford.

In this family's neighborhood the father of three had recently died. Jane Smith and her family shared Christmas Day with these children. When the Smith children discovered that their visitors had received no presents, each in his or her own way voluntarily gave away to the guests the only present he or she had received.

This powerful story raises the question of how we can communicate this kind of human concern through our institutions. I believe that the family, and relationships within the family, are probably the most powerful means of transmitting the culture, particularly our highest ideals.

Jane Smith had all the strikes against her — poor, minority, living in a city ghetto — yet she demonstrated a high degree of civic ethics. She has never read the great tomes of our philosophers, but somehow she was able to pass on to her children a marvelous heritage. We have to capture that.

Louis J Rubin

It's a point that I think will repeatedly occur during the discussion. We live in a cult of self-concern, which may indeed impede our quest for a spirit of human concern.

Richard A Graham

It seems to me the notion of a polarity of ethical viewpoints has come out in this discussion in two or three ways. As Dr. Adams has cited, there is the polarity of social convention as

opposed to individual autonomy. One of the background publications that Russ Hill mentioned, *Recommendations for Research, Development, and Dissemination for Ethical-Citizenship Education* (Research for Better Schools, 1977) also raises this issue. It states that somewhere there should be organizations advocating the basic ethical-citizenship principles of our society; polarity enters in when the document goes on to say that these principles must also be common to persons of all cultural backgrounds and all religious persuasions. It is hard to see how you can develop a program based upon the ethical and moral views of our society and expect that these views will also be compatible with those of all other societies. If there are universal moral principles, they will be arrived at by individuals capable of autonomous reasoning no matter what their society. But only a small part of any society is capable of such reasoning. The great majority hold to the conventional ethics of their own society, to conventions that often conflict with those of other societies.

But you can find a synthesis in the apparent polarity of teaching conventional values, on one hand, and developing universal principles, on the other. The synthesis derives from recent findings in developmental psychology. This work (Kohlberg's, for instance) shows that individuals must *first* develop the ethics — of social convention, of belonging to something — and only *then* can they move on to autonomous reasoning that embraces universal principles. It follows that the first job is to provide an educational system — through the family, the church, the neighborhood, the schools, peers — that brings kids into their society, that helps them become a member of a group that shares conventional values. This task is particularly difficult for children who may need it most: the poor, the minorities, and dropouts, the unemployed — in short, the already alienated. But it can be done. It is being done, although adopting conventional values isn't intended to be an end all. It may turn out to be for some, but it's a necessary step for all.

Ralph W Tyler

I want to comment generally on the issues regarding our core civic ethics. We can find a series of basic similarities in the values that the American people — the vast majority of them — consider important. They grow out of not a single source but many sources: the experience of different religious groups, the concrete experience of living together.

The problem of values, the reason we select some as moral and others as not, is that the attainment of some of them is at more or less cost. That's where you encounter dilemmas. If I'm going to care about others — to refer to Mr. Ellis's Christmas-

story illustration — and feel strongly that I want to help those kids, I give up my present; that is a cost. Nobody mentions values that are of no cost to anybody. It's easy to be pleasant as long as there is no difficulty; it's easy to be kind if it doesn't cost you anything.

But we are concerned about values that, for young people, need to be developed because, without careful consideration, without reflection, the cost precludes their spontaneous development. Furthermore, typically we express values in such a way that in many real situations they are in conflict. Some of Kohlberg's work focuses exactly on an intellectual examination of conflict of values embedded in moral dilemmas.

I want to make another point. We have not only conflicts but also the problem of newly developing moralities. More and more, we have to define the content and the context of moralities, especially with respect to communities that become exclusive: e.g., the Jewish community, the black community, the Italian community. This may fractionate the oneness of people, requiring the redevelopment of values or ethics.

Louis J. Rubin

That seems to bring us to the second question. Will you lead off, Ralph?

WHAT IS THE SCHOOL'S RESPONSIBILITY FOR TEACHING THESE CORE CIVIC ETHICS?

Ralph W Tyler

Schools don't start with highly developed, moral children. They do, however, start with children who, for the most part, have been exposed in their homes to certain principles: honesty, for instance, or concern for brothers and sisters and neighbors. Schools can build on this foundation. And one thing the school can do is continue to be a better moral community, albeit an academic one, than is typically found outside the school walls.

I've visited many schools in my 56 years of teaching, and I find that, by and large, most are ethical communities. The kids think they are treated fairly, and they see respect and caring. Most teachers (in spite of criticism to the contrary) care about their students and establish the kind of classroom environment which shows this care.

Children's initial attachment to values comes from direct experience in the home, experience which helps them discover that if the other fellow is pleased by their ethical action, in turn their pleasure in that ethical action is increased. Part of the role of the home, the school, and direct experience is to help children realize that it is a good thing, not a terrible thing, to derive satisfaction from doing good and sacrificing for others.

The school has another responsibility, one not typically shared by the home although sometimes shared by religious institutions. And that is to help students begin to explore the implications of core civic ethics, particularly with respect to the broader community. What does it mean, for example, to lie? Every kid knows what a lie is, but what more does it mean? With guidance, children can begin to explore this, begin to consider implications. This exploration is the role of literature, the role of social studies — beginning to discover that a complication of any moral code is that some of its elements are in conflict in particular situations. The school can provide the intellectual basis for this exploration.

I was an advisor to a study of Catholic education some years ago, and more recently to a study of Jewish education, and I found in both cases that the critical period in moral development is adolescence. This is the time when young people begin to seek an intellectual basis for what has been almost

a blind adherence to a social code or convention. The school can further the search, especially with literature and social studies, but even with science and mathematics.

Russell L Adams

For me the school has a paramount responsibility to teach these core civic ethics. Schools have always been miniature formal versions of both what society is and what it ought to be. As is the neighborhood, so is the school, so that we tend to get a clustering of factors in schools that parallel and resemble the neighborhood.

Another point: In most societies schools function as the one place where theories — whether related to justice or core values — may be weighed with minimal immediate risk. School is a place where alternative futures may be explored short of a point of no return, where students can fall on their faces and get up and try again. General Motors will wipe you out if you are responsible for designing a bad model. But schools permit you to make mistakes without being devastated. This is what we call learning. At the university level, even professors can fail again and again and again.

Ralph W Tyler

And often do.

Louis J Rubin

Would you want the schools to indoctrinate kids with certain ideas, certain core ethics?

Russell L Adams

I am saying just that. It is a prime responsibility of the schools. Schools never were neutral about core civic values. Certainly not the segregated high school I went to in South Georgia, where we were afraid to sing "Jeannie with the Light Brown Hair" — and Jeannie wasn't black. So I think it is useful to ask whether we are being affected by a decline in the optimism that once characterized public education.

Ralph W Tyler

And the energy.

Russell L Adams

Right. For me, between 1900 and 1940 the public school system of this nation made promises to learners that the economy could make good on. In other words, the message to students was: If you do A, B, C, and D, you will get a reward of a certain kind. So the skyscrapers went up to house (reward) those white-collar employees. Now the economy is faltering. Furthermore, the computer revolution makes some education redundant, that is, a computer can do the work of many persons taught to handle addition, subtraction, and so on.

As a result of these and other factors, we are facing a sense of limits, of loss and disappointment, and therefore a failure of learning. I think, however, this is part of a cyclical swing, and I also think that our pessimism is premature.

Max Lerner

I'd like to address myself to what Dr. Adams has so sharply and eloquently said. I go back to the Periclean statement that all politics is character. If that is true, and I think it is, then education is an experiment and an experience in character formation.

The problem is, of course, that the Greeks had an essentially homogeneous society, at least among the citizenry, and so it was easy for them to make such a statement about politics; we, on the other hand, have an essentially pluralistic society, which raises many problems unknown to the Greeks. We have a great temptation — and a dangerous one — to use the schools for character formation in a monistic way, that is, in a single direction. The temptation is all the greater because of our recent social experience. Since the beginning of the twentieth century we have been through a period of uprootings: uprootings from the land, from the farm, from the small towns, from the small community, from the family, from the church. As a civilization, we are today a welter of people, our connections broken and our roots uprooted.

Because of these uprootings, the waning of deep religious belief, the battered American family, geographical movement, and social mobility, a vacuum has developed, a vacuum in value formation. Our temptation, then, is to dump the abdicated responsibility on the schools, to make them the residuary legatees in bankruptcy, to make them do what other

institutions had previously done. Let us recognize that schools cannot do all this alone. They can select certain things to do, but they cannot do everything.

This brings us to the question of indoctrination. I am unequivocally against the idea of the schools indoctrinating values. Nevertheless, I am deeply committed to the proposition that the schools must deal with values and with the "fiery centrality of values" in our lives. How do I resolve these positions? By saying that the function of the schools in value formation is not to indoctrinate, but to do two other things:

First, recognize and build on the fact that a teacher is a living example of values in action, values in growth. From that standpoint, he or she is a figure for value identification by students, and we had better clearly understand this. I have told teachers' groups for many years that what we teach is, basically, ourselves. Whatever it is that we teachers are as human beings is what we present to our students and, in fact, to their families with whom we have contact.

Second, use the classroom, playground, workshops, and laboratory as arenas for values dialogue. These approaches are in sharp contrast to the teacher saying, "I know what the right values are, and here they are" — a doctrinaire approach.

We can then match our experience together: I have more experience than you, you have different experience from mine. Thus develops a values dialogue among students, between students and teacher, and between teachers and parents. If Dr. Adams's "convergence" means that I (my values) agree with you (your values), this doesn't happen by itself.

Russell L Adams

Of course not.

Louis J Rubin

Dr. Lerner, if you were to write that series of arguments in your column in *the New York Post*, it is predictable that some parent would write you a letter saying, "Dr. Lerner, I want the school to teach my sons and daughters the values I hold dear. I don't want any dialogue." What would you answer?

Max Lerner

I would say that as parents you have a responsibility in your home and in your family to teach the values you hold dear. And you had better not abdicate that responsibility.

One reason the schools bear such a heavy burden is your abdication of responsibilities once assumed by the home.

There are millions of broken families. Let us start with that. Unwed mothers in high schools, absent fathers, the strictures of poverty, mental disease — these are the social realities. Let us face another social reality: Schools have not functioned well, partly because their burden has been so great and partly because of the fragmentation of society. This makes the teacher's role as a value identification figure crucial.

Russell L Adams

May I respond to Dr. Lerner's comment on indoctrination? Is it possible to model without that model representing a value? In other words, is it possible to act without that action affecting — in one way or another — a value? I submit that all teaching implicitly and explicitly has a value connotation.

There is, then, a continuing dilemma that we educators must somehow continuously try to resolve — to avoid the extremes that Professor Lerner is calling attention to, that is, political indoctrination, and at the same time not lose the opportunity that is there anyway. The opportunity will either be taken or not taken. An opportunity not taken is still a value not realized.

Max Lerner

Very good.

Ralph W Tyler

As an educational psychologist I should like to point out that in a society with as many means of communication as we have, indoctrination is almost impossible with youth. That is to say, children are exposed to many more models than those in the school. The responsibility of the school is to have teachers who represent the core values we're talking about, because other, often conflicting, models abound.

I worked for three years in one of the worst ghettos in Detroit, in four elementary schools. Some of the models children saw were hustlers, drug pushers, and the like. It is the school's responsibility not just to postulate opposing values, but to help the kids, in dialogue, as you say, to explore the consequences of various values. Because the test — the empirical test — of a value is: Does it have conse-

quences that are good for me? You don't expect a person to emulate a model's values if the consequences are distasteful. So the effort in that ghetto was to help these kids not only see that their teachers modeled different values than those of the hustlers, but to begin to explore questions like: What happened to those hustlers? How much time did they spend in jail? What happens to people who are kind and considerate? That kind of exploration, it seems to me, the school can do.

Carol Kimmel

I would like to comment on that. All of us know that historically our schools have been expected to socialize children according to national standards and wishes. But today we are living in a new world. How can we teach civic ethics in the schools, when the adult models children grow up with in the home and the community, in TV and the media, do not teach the same ethics? How can we expect the school to do this job when children spend more time out of school receiving contrary messages?

Louis J Rubin

If there were a radical educator present —

Ralph W Tyler

That's a contradiction in terms.

Louis J Rubin

If there were a radical educator present, the indictment would be that you gentlemen and ladies are guilty of wishful thinking. The schools are composed of real people, and they are not all moral. Schools are bureaucracies, and bureaucracies frequently model immorality. To assume that the American school can be made into a paragon of virtue, to deny that it can be shoddy where human affairs are concerned, is myopic. What would you say to that?

Max Lerner

There is a difference between being a radical educator and being a leftwing educator. I fancy myself as a radical

educator. I do not regard the school as an instrument for rebuilding our particular form of society. It's a very different question. I would certainly agree that in every society the schools obviously must — and to a considerable degree do — reflect both the power structure and the ethnicity structure. This is simply a fact, an unavoidable fact.

I think what we can do is minimize the extent to which the schools are used as a weapon in class struggle or political struggle. In particular, we can minimize the extent to which they are used as an instrument for rigidifying the society. Instead, they must be used as an instrument for flexibility and growth, not only in the individual lives of the students but in the society as a whole.

With regard to some of the class-theory critics of American education (I am a critic from another, more radical standpoint, radical in the sense of the deep-rootedness of the problems involved), one answer is that the American civilization is in sharp contrast to many others that have died of rigidity, the rigidity of particular institutions. A crucial characteristic of American history has been the flexibility of response our society has shown to challenges of every kind.

Our one instance of a rigidified institution was slavery, and the result was the Civil War, which put a scar across the whole national consciousness. There was another chance to rigidify our capitalist power institutions, but we have remained flexible in that respect.

From this standpoint I would say that class theory has only a minimal relevance to current problems. By all means, let us assume a radical approach, if by radical we mean a need to root our educational thinking in a conception of human nature, of human growth, of human needs, of the relationship between education and society.

John Ellis

We have a paradox. Schools are asked to do too much, but at the same time they must do more, or perhaps do things differently. Let me try to categorize four things I believe to be the responsibility of the schools:

First, set an example in the way they treat people, not just through the personality and modeling of the teacher, but also through the form of administration processes and the attitudes of all the people who interface with the students.

Second, provide solid course content.

Third, provide experiences that enable students to grow as human beings and to develop intellectual and technical skills.

Fourth, develop connections. By this I mean we have to help students see the relationships among society, work, and change and how they fit into the whole process. Can schools do this? I think so, and here is where I disagree in part with the distinguished Max Lerner. I don't believe that the schools are a failure. Too often that claim is made by those not on the school scene. In fact, the schools of America are responding well under very difficult circumstances. The next question is: Can they — even if they are not doing so now — do what ought to be done? Again, I would argue yes; we must rely upon the schools.

I say schools can do what ought to be done for several reasons. First of all, almost everyone attends schools, and so we have a common institutional base. Next, as others have pointed out, family life is very different with the advent of television, with both parents in many families working, with unprecedented social change and complexity. While the churches, the *PTA*s, the *Scouts*, the youth clubs, and others will have to participate in the effort, schools provide a central institution where these things can happen. Last, I would submit that the schools can do anything society demands, and have done so in the past. Schools have sold war bonds. Schools have run scrap drives. When it was necessary, schools have developed and trained scientists to get to the moon. Schools have served as disaster centers. When there is a drug abuse problem, the schools are called upon. When there is a problem with employment opportunity and selection, schools invent career education. When we are worried about racial integration, we turn to the schools. When we try to get the handicapped into the mainstream, we turn to the schools for help. To repeat, the schools can do what society wants them to do.

But we face three dilemmas:

One, we do not now have a general consensus on what the schools *should* do. To take a ludicrous example, I have faced people, elected as public officials, who believe that the school lunch program is a communist plot to break up family responsibilities! This simply highlights the problem that educators at all levels face: the diversity of our expectations for the schools.

Two, we do not have an equitable resource base among districts or states. Access (or lack of it) to a good education today is all too frequently an accident of geography.

Three, we lack effective coordination among government agencies and private enterprise to work together on the pervasive problems. For example, one of the great moral dilemmas of our time is how to achieve an integrated society, yet we are not devoting attention to it with coordinated concern.

I would argue that we load too many responsibilities on the schools, holding out unjustified expectations on what they can deliver. Unless better connections are developed between

schools and other agencies in society (realtors, bankers, lending institutions, other agencies of the federal government), our hopes are doomed to failure. The schools cannot perform impossible tasks. We have an obligation to provide the resources and connections that will enable schools to succeed. If we do not do this, the failure is ours, not the schools'.

Max Lerner

First of all, I cannot share your belief in the perfectability of man. I have tried to stress the double human endowment, that of both human destructiveness and human possibility.

Second, if I simply tell a student that immoral behavior will cause pimples, he will regard it as a peculiar statement emanating from an equally peculiar-looking man, his classroom teacher, who doesn't really know what it's all about. But if I can get him involved in discussions with me, with other teachers, with other pupils, and with his peer group, and if experiences come out of those discussions that he can identify with, he will then come to his own conclusion that immoral behavior produces pimples; that is, he will then have internally rationalized the conclusion. And that couldn't possibly hold true if I, his teacher, just told it to him.

Russell L Adams

I agree with Professor Lerner.

Louis J Rubin

About the pimples?

Russell L Adams

The argument from concrete consequences.

Max Lerner

Actually, immoral behavior usually does away with pimples!

Russell L Adams

I want to call our attention to the kinds of actions whose consequences are pimpleless; that is, behavior whose consequences we cannot know without the provision of advance information. I'm not arguing from the point of view of indoctrinating, of laying out a party line. All I'm saying is that sometimes there are consequences that have to be announced as well as experienced, and I think schools should spend substantial time doing just that. This relates to my earlier comments about schools dealing with the world as it is and as it can be. It is the "can be," prescriptive kind of training that looks at consequences which cannot be experienced, experiences which must be learned in a didactic sense, in a sense of preinformation.

Let me make one more comment about what the schools are doing in terms of overload. This point makes a transition to the third symposium question. We have not talked today about what I call the "escalator" effect of access to education in terms of social classes. It is not fully recognized that for the first time in history schools are attempting to serve far wider strata of our society. This truth becomes vivid when one travels in the Southwest, where school populations include Mexican-American, rural Southern (both black and white), and inner-city students. These schools, serving relatively new populations in terms of massive access possibilities, lack the support they require.

When earlier, privileged groups dominated school roles in the sense of a certain kind, number, and leverage, there was some sort of one-to-one correspondence between the classes served and their political resources to demand and support service. Today there is an imbalance, with the have-nots demanding service, the delivery of which their political and social muscle cannot assure. We erroneously interpreted this as pathology rather than as the truth: that there is an imbalance between the differing social classes attending school and their differing resources for justifying and underwriting that attendance.

Louis J Rubin

All right, gentlemen. First we have reached some consensus as to what core civic ethics, in your judgment, are central to our democracy. Next we have explored your opinions regarding the school's responsibility in teaching these ethics. Now the third question: How do we move from where we are toward a more golden land?

WHAT IMMEDIATE ACTION MIGHT THE SCHOOL TAKE REGARDING INSTRUCTION IN THESE CORE CIVIC ETHICS?

Ralph W Tyler

May I respond first, since I have lived longer in schools than anybody else here? Over the years schools have been called upon to do many things from a central position. During the first World War, when I was in college, it was to save food. During the Prohibition Era it was to teach the evils of drink. During another early period we developed a large federal program on "Air Age" education. This list could be enlarged, but the point is that most of those programs have been forgotten.

The efforts that have remained (in my opinion), in terms of reform, are those that developed from the grass roots during the Great Depression. One example was the *Eight Year Study*, in which 30 school systems, each working as best it could with its own community, developed programs and a network of communication and workshops to render technical assistance. These programs were able to make so great an impact that after 1940 secondary schools were dramatically different. During the Depression period, youths entered secondary schools because they couldn't get jobs. High schools were filled with students who had no intention of going to college and no intention of following the vocational education programs then available. The schools were able to adapt *at the local level* to this radical change in student composition and expectation.

So I think the first thing to understand is that people cannot bring about reforms in the schools directly from Washington or from Albany or from Sacramento. Reforms have to come about naturally in places where the schools are ready for and wish to institute change. I was Vice-Chairman of the National Council on Disadvantaged Children in 1965. Suddenly nearly a billion dollars was made available the first year of this program, and this figure rose to a billion and a half before I left the Council. To underline my point, we found that money was awarded to some localities which had no desire to do anything for disadvantaged schools and therefore did nothing worthwhile with the funds.

Change only happens bit by bit as school systems become aroused to and ready for it. I strongly emphasize that in

advocating programs of moral/civic/citizenship education, we must concentrate on encouraging and assisting those local schools and communities which really want such programs; the movement will then spread. If you start the other way around, imposing or handing down a national program, it's going to go the way of the forgotten "Air Age" education program and others like it. That isn't the way American schools improve.

Louis J Rubin

Ralph, you have written that great progress in education has often occurred during periods of "amity," quietness.

Ralph W Tyler

Also during periods of austerity. It is an interesting phenomenon that the reform movements take place primarily during periods of relative recession or depression. There was nothing outstanding about the progress of the American school system during the affluent 1920s. There was, however, significant progress during the depressed 1930s; indeed, one could go back to the 1860s, when the Morrill Act was passed and we began to develop the land-grant colleges. It is historic fact that during periods of austerity people no longer chase dollars because there aren't any dollars to chase; so they begin to chase quality.

I think, then, that today is an ideal time to make important improvements, such as the teaching of civic ethics, in our schools because I don't see many dollars ahead to chase.

Louis J Rubin

Russ Adams, how about a few more pearls from you?

Ralph W Tyler

Some of them are diamonds.

Russell L Adams

Thank you. I have listed several immediate actions schools might take regarding instruction in civic ethics:

First, examine value-oriented statements school personnel routinely invoke with pupils and their parents. What hap-

pens when you have a parent/student conference? Many value judgments are exchanged, but we don't really follow through and analyze these unless a clash becomes so clear it cannot be ignored.

Second, initiate informal efforts to locate linkages between emergent civic values of learners and their individual ethics. Dilemmas would be useful here.

Third, conduct clarification exercises. One informal method might be to analyze students' complaints. Is a complaint justified? How can the matter be resolved?

Fourth, conduct exercises to make explicit the values implicit in certain kinds of student governments and expression.

Fifth, a comment on cultural differences (one of my interests) which might be titled "Conceptualizing Cultural Differences as Dividends." We move in with our dukes up, you see, in dealing with cultural differences. Instead, why not conceptualize them as dividends? For instance, schools — via curricular changes — could explicitly seek and reveal commonalities of values beneath superficial matters of color, peer concerns, and so on. Quite often student interaction in a newly desegregated school proves the falseness of previously and mutually held stereotypes — and many times the stereotypes are false. For another example, identify and use relatively culture-free functions as neutral containers of certain differentiated values. In other words, in a typing class, typing efficiency might be a positive value-free requirement for all students, independent of their backgrounds. Good performance might generate a higher level of tolerance for those who fare poorly on culture-biased tasks. We already do this in certain sports.

Louis J Rubin

How would that help morality or ethics?

Ralph W Tyler

Respect for the dignity and worth of other human beings.

Russell L Adams

Another dividend might accrue from intensive cross-cultural acculturation analyses to determine whether reality underlies projected stereotypes. I ran across a study done at the University of Denver in which subjects were asked whether Mexican-American youngsters were fatalistic,

blindly obedient to authority, time-carefree, self-concept damaged, and so on. While extensive data had shown that there was no statistical difference between Mexican-American and Anglo-American values on those points, the survey revealed that the stereotype persisted. The same approach can be applied to black America again and again and again in terms of stereotypes that we regard as deficits indigenous to blacks.

There are other cross-cultural approaches. Check out the use to which the allegedly symbolic-management-deficient poor are actually directing their symbol-making energies. To take an example, the black inner-city youngster is generally considered deficient in handling symbols. What educators are just beginning to understand is that blacks have a high level of symbol-management skill which is simply directed at other targets. They do fantastic symbolic feats with words, slang, music, and highly symbolic games.

We could also take a second look at the stereotype of inner-city kids as having short attention spans. Yet they manage to obtain that transistor radio (that bothers you in public) through hours and hours of concentrated planning, be it gotten by theft or by purchase.

Next, we might reexamine what I call the work-survival rationalities of the allegedly "lazy" inner-city poor. When one of these persons works at three jobs simultaneously to get one average income, you can hardly call that worker — and the model he or she sets for the kid — "lazy"; the stereotype is completely out of line.

These are some things that can help us to arrive at the reality behind stereotypes and capitalize on the dividends of cultural differences. These activities must be supported. In fact, many, many "old-fashioned" black and white teachers used to do these things, although they lacked the terminology to describe them.

John Ellis

I think Dr. Adams has expressed a variety of techniques that would have a profound impact on education. We might differ on some subtle interpretations, but I think he is on track in his ideas and in his emphasis on practical ways in which we can work.

As I look at the question of what immediate action schools might take regarding instruction in our core civic ethics, I am staggered by the realization that if we attempt to function in this area, we are going to find ourselves floundering. So I would like to turn the question a bit and suggest six things which I think we could profitably pursue:

First, develop national leadership for ethical-citizenship

education. We currently lack a forum to serve this purpose. With all its frailties, the *Educational Policies Commission* used to provide such leadership, but we have all become so separate today. The *NEA*, the *AFT*, the *PTA*, the *School Board Association*, administrators, and parents groups tend to be going off in different directions. Private schools don't talk to the public schools as often as they ought to. We need national leadership that can speak to the common concerns and help us focus our resources on them.

Second — the reverse side of the coin — encourage the development of local leadership, particularly at the principal's level. I have worked with school systems and with teachers on curriculum building and textbook selection; I have been nailed to the wall by teachers' groups and parents' groups and protest groups; and I have to say (simplistic as it sounds) that, as a rule, if you have a good principal, you have a good school. You can virtually feel the personality of a principal by walking into his or her building. Of course this is not to say that the principal carries the whole load, but if we aim at leverage in promoting educational improvement, I would emphasize the importance of the principal's role.

Third, develop local forums for consensus-building. There is widespread disagreement about whether schools are failing, about what schools should be doing. I have no simple solution for that except to get people together in dialogues (and, incidentally, I believe in human rationality) to build consensus about what it is we want the schools to be doing. I think that would immeasurably aid our efforts to teach civic education.

Fourth, formulate a description of the common competencies or survival skills, including those of civic ethics and citizenship, that are essential for life in this part of the century. This is of course an extension of the competency-based instruction phenomenon, graduation requirements, national examinations, and the like, with which almost all our school systems are engaged.

Fifth, build a larger constituency base for schools. Schools are losing support partly as a matter of demographics. One out of every five Americans today lives alone. We are well aware that there is a decline in the number of students attending school, and by 1980 that decline will hit the colleges. These declining enrollments are causing shocks in the educational establishment. Most educators today were brought up on the concept of school growth, and it is difficult for us to realign our concepts and skills to the notions of restraint or reduction. If we are to have sufficient support for schools, we must build a larger constituency because there are fewer children in the schools. The problem is further compounded by an increasingly aging population which has reconfig-

ured the constituency base schools used to count on. One way we can increase the constituency base is to get out of the school buildings. We were forced to do this in Columbus, Ohio, when 150 schools had to close because of the gas shortage. We engaged in what we called "school without schools." We took education into the community and found there an enormous array of available educational expertise creative enough to make connections with schools.

Sixth, handle the problem of fiscal equity within the next 10 or 20 years. Disparity of wealth among the states is substantial. Disparity of wealth among the cities and school districts within a state is substantial. These conditions have a profound impact on the capacity of school systems to deliver whatever it is a society says they must deliver, and that financial problem must be solved.

Louis J Rubin

Let me put one quick question to you before you close. You mention the competency-examination, performance-based instructional trends. Suppose you were in charge of one of the U.S. Office of Education's funding bureaus, and suppose I came to you and asked for, say, $300,000 to develop an examination in moral or ethical competence. Would you call me a lunatic and send me on my way, or would you be inclined to give some thought to my proposition?

John Ellis

First, a correction on your assumption. I'm not certain anyone is in charge of any of our bureaus!

Your question is a serious one which deserves attention. If your intent would be to develop a ethical-competence national examination, I think I would be inclined to say no. But if your intent would be to explore the whole domain and to help clarify what schools can and should achieve, then I think it is worth consideration. We do not now give this content area sufficient attention, and I think we ought to welcome RFPs or whatever other avenues are open to us.

Carol Kimmel

John, don't you think that if you tried to fund a program involving inquiries about personal values and morals, you would encounter the resistance of persons feeling that you were delving into their private domain? Wouldn't that be a problem?

John Ellis

It's an explosive area. People get disturbed when certain words are sounded. Nevertheless, I don't think we ought to be intimidated by the difficulty of the problem if it is — as I believe it is — a significant issue. How we ought to go about it requires definition.

Louis J Rubin

Max, what we need is a prescription for the schools of the future.

Max Lerner

I'm the wrong man to answer that. I've been listening to these extremely provocative, practical approaches, and I agree with all of them, actually. And yet when Dr. Ellis says he is always practical, it petrifies me because I am hardly ever practical. People say, "Let us descend to the particular." My answer is, "Let us ascend to the general." And there is some point to this combination because obviously while we, in the school system, need the particulars, the particulars must be rooted in clarity about the general.

Let me first be very particular. There are obviously problem areas. The youngsters in the schools, and their families, are involved with these, and we need direct approaches to them. We are all familiar with the problem areas of drugs, of irresponsible pregnancies, of violence, of crime, of fanaticism, of racial hatred, of class hatred. I think the single problem area that probably embraces all of these is pervasive desensitizing. I think that a very extensive desensitizing has taken place, both among youngsters and their families.

I see this as linked with what I regard as the great American disease: the imperial ego. By the imperial ego, I mean the sense that anything goes, not only for the individual but for the group. I think, to be very practical, one must tackle that attitude, too.

It is interesting to me that we have not yet really defined what a value is. For me, values are intimately related to two questions. First, what is worthwhile in life? Second, what questions do we and shall we put to life? In those terms, I think it is clear that the school does far better to clarify the basic life questions, not try to give answers to them. From that standpoint, I very much agree with at least one part of the Kohlberg approach: the use of moral dilemmas, life dilemmas, life situations, in an effort to clarify what is involved in putting questions to life.

Dr. Adams correctly speaks of the importance of cross-cultural experience. I would like to add to that the importance of cross-generational experience. Our schools are the weaker because they exclude older people. I have recently been impressed by what community colleges have accomplished in melding older and middle-aged people into the educational process. I wish the same were true of the school system, so that young people would be able to have the experience of the three-generation living together once characteristic of families. This would give students a chance to see the life cycle at first-hand, to recognize that we oldsters have creativity and the wisdom of experience to offer. In a larger sense, such an arrangement would help to counteract what I consider the most pernicious form of segregation today: age-group segregation. It stultifies and impoverishes the school experience.

I equally recommend a commingling of work and school. Work experience should very much be part of school, and school experience very much a part of work.

Further, I think there is a crucial need to assess what kind of nutrition — or lack of it — kids get outside of school. The question of additives, the question of toxics, which I believe are related to the problems of violence and criminality, have not yet begun to be explored.

I would like to add one more dimension to this discussion. I am deeply concerned not only with growth of the individual but also with the individual as an organism. I think the mechanistic paradigm we have used heretofore in our social thinking — that man is a machine and society is a machine — is crucially false. Man is an organism, society is an organism, and everything in that society is an organism. Schools and families can point this up by dealing with the entire life cycle, the growth that we experience throughout the life cycle. Education in the schools, of course, is only a portion of that cycle, although recently higher education has widened that portion.

Let me indicate other phases of the human life cycle:

First, man as producer. I have just said the schools should connect more with this aspect, the world of work.

Second, *homo ludens*, man at play. The schools do deal with this dimension, but they don't extend it in terms of man continuing to be *homo ludens* throughout his life. The school emphasis is instead on work, on the cognitive, not on play.

Third, man as thinker. The schools do, of course, stress this aspect, but only in cognitive terms, never in intuitive terms. Research shows that the two brain hemispheres, representing separately cognition and intuition, are intended to work in tandem.

Fourth, man as lover, the generative aspect of man. I

mean by this, man as lover of his fellow men, lover in the heterosexual terms, lover of God. We have been leery of the erotic aspect of this perspective, but we must learn to cope with it and be comfortable with its importance in our lives.
Fifth, civic man, man governing, man being governed. That is presumably the central idea of this symposium, but here I'm trying to put it in perspective.
Sixth, man as explorer, exploring everything, moving into the skies, moving into the brain, always exploring.
Finally, man worshipping, man reverencing, whatever you want to call it. The principle of the divine, nature as a whole, some particular god or gods — all belong to man reverencing.

I suggest that education must take a more realistic view of the total human organism in its many life-cycle phases. John Dryden said, "Thy chase had a beast in view." What is the beast we have in view when we talk of schooling, of education, of values? I submit that in the broadest terms the schools must be fertilizing ground for the growth of the whole person in the total life cycle, in the total civilization.

Louis J Rubin

We have time, alas, for only a general comment or two on this provocative dialogue.

CLOSING COMMENTS

Brian J Larkin

I represent only myself, not my constituency.

I have heard a number of assumptions made today about decline; for instance, falling standards, erosion, decline of enrollments, failure of the schools, breakdown of the family, decline of the family, decline of test scores, immorality — the whole bit. I want to question those assumptions because to accept them as an underlying definition or cause of the problem provokes a particular pattern of responses. For example, if we accept these kinds of assumptions, then an appropriate response to falling test scores would be to raise the test scores by going "back to basics." Likewise, an appropriate response to the decline or breakdown of the family would be to restore the traditional family unit.

Suppose, however, we were to take a different approach and view these problems not as evidence of decline but as evidence of transition, of movement from one position to another. This assumption elicits a significantly different set of responses.

To illustrate, if we are considering problems related to the change in the structure and nature of the family, we have a choice between adopting a positive, forward-looking stance or a retrospective nostalgia. I wish we would consider this choice before taking for granted some of the assumptions implied today.

I have no serious disagreement with the core civic ethics identified in the first symposium question, although I might label and cluster them a little differently. While I have no quarrel with the suggestions for the school's responsibility and role as outlined today, I would like to add that another framework really belongs in the school: the notion of a divergency model of human behavior. I mean by this the concept of a simple continuum from real behavior to idealized behavior, the difference being explained by a set of value conflicts inherent in the idealized behavior.

The question of citizenship values, it seems to me, takes us into a somewhat broader and different context than that indicated by Dr. Lerner. I have two questions on this point.

Jerry Fletcher raised a significant point when he asked what a value (no matter which particular one) means in action. Take, for instance, the value of respect for human dignity, to which we have all agreed implicitly. In action this value creates a tension between the need for greater social cohesion and the desire to promote cultural pluralism. So my first question is: What do values mean when caught in such a tension?

My second question is: What does national or ethical citizenship mean in a globally interdependent world? What are the requirements of citizenship? Most of us, and most people in education, tend to assume that there is a kind of national model of citizenship, the kind of model that Charles Beard identified in his works with the Beard Commission in 1929-34. That was a national model of citizenship. None of us today has talked about behavioral citizenship requirements in an interdependent society.

Louis J Rubin

Were it not that we have just passed our ending time, that would be a provocative topic for further discussion. However, Dr. Larkin's questions are in the record, happily, and can be pondered at another time.

I think four things should be stressed about today's deliberations:

One, wise men and women, well-intentioned men and women, clearly can identify a core of civic ethics which are central to our democracy.

Two, there seems to be a clear consensus among our panelists — of rather different backgrounds and certainly different professional interests — that the schools do indeed have a responsibility to deal with these civic ethics, in one way or another.

Three, there seems to be a clear consensus that what the schools might do, more than anything else, is to personify in its own character, operation, and administration the kind of civic and ethical principles basic to our society.

Four, all our discussions reflected a deliberate unwillingness to deal with the issue of values in an isolated context, as an abstract issue unto itself. All of us here clearly see school action with respect to civic ethics as a part of a larger educational goal. All of us see ethical-citizenship education as central to the total educational purpose. And our proposals for school action in this domain apply not just to science or history or the social studies, but to the totality of the school endeavor. It seems to me that we have done our work well — and that we deserve to be heard.

I need now only thank you for your kind attention, and thank our distinguished panelists for their contribution.

Russell A Hill

Thank you all for your consideration of the issues. We plan to move forward and formulate some specific actions for ethical-citizenship education that make sense in the context of today's America. You will be hearing from us. Thank you.

Appendix 1: Panelists and Participants

Russell L. Adams
Chairman
Department of Afro-American Studies
Howard University

Mrs. Russell L. Adams

Robert C. Andringa
Minority Staff Director
House Education and Labor Committee

(Msgr.) Francis X. Barrett
Executive Director
Department of Chief Administrators of Catholic Education
National Catholic Education Association

Max W. Beck
Analyst
Ethical-Citizenship Education
Research for Better Schools

John Ellis
Executive Deputy Commissioner for Educational Programs
U.S. Office of Education

Karen Dawson
Educational Program Specialist
U.S. Office of Education

Lawrence Flake
Administrator of Church Education System — Northeast USA
Church of the Latter Day Saints

Jerry L. Fletcher
Senior Policy Analyst in Education
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

Gregory Fusco
Minority Staff Director
Senate Human Resources Committee

Polly Gault
Administrative Assistant to
The Honorable R. S. Schweiker

Richard A. Graham
Consultant
U.S. Department of Labor

Ellen Griffin
Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education
U.S. Office of Education

Russell A. Hill
Director
Ethical-Citizenship Education
Research for Better Schools

Sam Hunt
Professional Staff Member
Senate Appropriations Committee

Margaret J. Jones
Associate Director
National Foundation for the Improvement of Education

Carol Kimmel
Past President
National Congress of Parents and Teachers

Brian J. Larkin
Executive Director
National Council for the Social Studies

Max Lerner
Author, Lecturer
Syndicated Columnist, *New York Post*

Louis M. Maguire
Director
Research and Development
Research for Better Schools

George E. Lowe
Staff Director
Task Force on Citizen Education
U.S. Office of Education

Elaine W. Marks
Teacher — NEA Executive Committee
National Education Association

Charlene Rothkopf
Media Coordinator
Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development

Louis J. Rubin
Professor-at-Large
University of Illinois

Logan H. Sallada
Policy Advisor to the Commissioner
U.S. Office of Education

Robert G. Scanlon
Executive Director
Research for Better Schools

E. Joseph Schneider
Secretary
Council for Educational Development and Research

Roberta E. Stanley
Legislative Aide to
The Honorable William D. Ford

Peter Treibley
President
Maryland State Teachers Association

Ralph W. Tyler
Senior Consultant
Office of the President
Science Research Associates, Inc.

Joan D. Wallace
Editor
Ethical-Citizenship Education
Research for Better Schools

Thomas Wolanin
Staff Director
House Subcommittee Select Education

Roger R. Woock
Senior Associate, Education Equity
Desegregation Studies Staff
National Institute of Education

Appendix 2: Biographical Sketches of Panelists

Russell L Adams received the Ph.D. degree in political science from the University of Chicago in 1971. He is Associate Professor of Afro-American Studies and Chairman, Department of Afro-American Studies, Howard University. Prior to his present position Dr. Adams served as Research Director, American Negro Emancipation Centennial Authority, 1961-63; Assistant Professor of Science, North Carolina Central University, 1965-67; Chairman, Department of Political Science, North Carolina Central University, 1967-69; and Acting Chairman, Division of Humanities, Federal City College, 1969-70. Dr. Adams is a consultant to several organizations, including the Montgomery County (Md.) schools and the Institute of Urban Research, Florida State University. He is a member of national commissions and task forces on Afro-American affairs and has written widely in this area as well as in political science. His book *Great Negroes Past and Present* (Afro-American Publishing Co., 1963), a standard of its genre, has been reprinted several times.

John Ellis received the Ph.D. degree from the Harvard University Graduate School of Education in 1964. His present position is Executive Deputy Commissioner for Educational Programs, U.S. Office of Education. Dr. Ellis served as Superintendent of Schools, Lakewood, Ohio, from 1966-71. From then until his recent move to OE, he was Superintendent of Schools, Columbus, Ohio. His accomplishments in Columbus included: the initiation of Project Unite, a major program of community involvement to improve schools; responsibility for the revision of a total reading and mathematics program; creation of alternative schools; the Columbus plan for pupil integration; and extensive curriculum expansion, including vocational education and "school-without-schools," the latter being an imaginative response to the energy crisis. In his present OE post Dr. Ellis is responsible for supervising six program bureaus, 10 regional offices, and other special programs.

Max Lerner received the Ph.D. degree from Brookings Graduate School of Economics and Government. He is variously author, professor, syndicated columnist, and lecturer. Dr. Lerner serves as Distinguished Professor of Human Behavior at the Graduate School of Human Behavior at San Diego, as well as a faculty member at the New School. Associated for many years with Brandeis University, Dr. Lerner is now Professor Emeritus. He has been Visiting Professor at Pomona College and the University of Florida and has also taught at Russell Sage, Harvard, Williams, and Sarah Lawrence. His widely read syndicated newspaper column appears throughout the United States and around the world. He has also published extensively in national magazines and professional periodicals. Dr. Lerner's books include *America As a Civilization; The Age of Overkill; Ideas Are Weapons; Tocqueville and American Civilization;* and *Values in Education*, a monograph on educational theory published by Phi Delta Kappa, 1976. He is currently at work on a new study of American Civilization in the 60s and 70s.

Louis J Rubin (Moderator) received the Ph.D. degree from the University of California, Berkeley, in 1952, in the specialty of curriculum. He is Professor-at-Large, College of Education, University of Illinois. Dr. Rubin has had extensive teaching experience, in secondary education from 1947-56 and in higher education from 1956 to the present. He was Executive Director of the Communications Coalition for Educational Change, Washington, D.C., from 1971-73, and Dean, Nova University, Ft. Lauderdale, Fla., 1970-71, among other administrative posts. Dr. Rubin has been an educational consultant to a variety of organizations, is a member or delegate of many groups and coalitions, and serves as a member of the Editorial Board of several educational journals. A widely published writer, Dr. Rubin was the editor of *The Future of Education: Perspectives on Tomorrow's Schooling* (Allyn and Bacon, 1975).

Ralph W Tyler received the Ph.D. degree from the University of Chicago in 1927. He currently serves as Senior Consultant, Science Research Associates; Director Emeritus, Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, Stanford University; and Vice-President, Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions. Dr. Tyler was for many years a faculty member of the University of Chicago, where he was Chairman of the Department of Education from 1938-48 and Dean of the Division of Social Sciences from 1948-53. Notable in Dr. Tyler's career was his position as Director of Evaluation for the renowned Eight-Year Study — a project which, in collaboration with teachers from 30 schools, developed new curricula and new evaluation devices appropriate to the drastic changes brought about by the Great Depression. Dr. Tyler is the author of the classic *Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction*, among many, many other publications.